HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 50 Monday, December 15, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

HUMPHREY: *Moscow's sounding board*.....(page 1)
NIXON: *Why he should hold the lead*.....(page 1)
ELECTIONS: *How much did labor spend?*....(page 2)
FEDERAL WASTE: *Where the money goes*(page 3)
RIGHT TO WORK: *How it can win*.....(page 4)

Moscow's Candidate: Soviet dictator Khrushchev played his card in the American political game, when he lifted Senator Hubert Humphrey (D.-Minn.) from obscurity and gave him political "visibility" as a contender for the Democratic crown in 1960. Only myopic members of the Capital press corps—who treated the whole fantastic story as merely that of an American legislator who happened to be in Moscow and by chance got an eight-hour private interview with the Kremlin head—think otherwise.

Khrushchev, according to Diplomatic Row, surveyed the American political scene after the election, assessed the Democrats as the best bet, rejected their front-running Senator Kennedy because he is a Catholic and chose the far-left Senator from Minnesota for exceptional favors. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt (whose husband awarded Soviet Russia its present potent status in the world power situation) cooperated well by tossing out Humphrey's name as her candidate for the Democratic nomination.

Why did Khrushchev pick this Senator, who is only in his second term, who enjoys no seniority position in the Senate and who rates only No. 4 among Democrats on the Foreign Relations Committee?

The answer is not exactly enveloped in mystery. Part of it is suggested by the comment last week of the West Berlin newspaper, Tagesspiegel*: "The American Senator appears to be the best propagandist the rulers in the Kremlin could wish to have at this critical moment." For Humphrey has demonstrated his usefulness to the Kremlin on previous occasions. At the time of the Iraq-Lebanon crisis this summer, the Soviets used Humphrey as a transmission belt for conveying their sentiments to our Government. Moreover, in the fall of 1957, when the Soviets had suffered one of their worst defeats at the hands of Secretary Dulles, the Minnesotan hurried to the rescue. In October of last year, the Kremlin sought to bulldoze Turkey; Dulles, after securing the okay of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, openly threatened to retaliate by bombing Soviet Russia if its Government moved aggressively against our ally.*

Result No. 1: disappearance of anti-Turkish bluster by Russia. Result No. 2: a world-wide radio propaganda drive by Moscow against Dulles, calling for his resignation. Senator Humphrey was one of the first Americans who echoed this Soviet line, remarking that the President should ask Dulles to resign.

Humphrey's far-left position in the American political spectrum has long been noted: he is one of the founding fathers of Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), started by left-wingers who sought to avoid public odium by separating themselves officially from the obvious Communist stooges that were rampant during and just after World War II; he has been an advocate of surrendering the offshore islands of Quemoy and the Matsus to Peiping; he has taken a position on the cessation of nuclear testing highly palatable to the director of Kremlin policy.

Washington's verdict: the "liberal" Democrats, triumphant in the recent election, have their Kremlin-blessed candidate. (The conservative Southerners have quite other ideas; see "Third Party" item, on page 3.)

Nixon and Rockefeller: Mrs. Ruth Murray, Vice Chairman of the Wisconsin Republican party, resigned last week, rather than "help organize and work for a party which might be turned over to Nelson Rockefeller." She added: "I am not going to spend my efforts the next two years to build up a party and turn it over to that group." Mrs. Murray, long a prominent member of the GOP in her state, emphasized that the national GOP had abandoned conservative Republican principles. In the Badger State, it is well known, Mrs. Murray speaks for a very large body of opinion. She acclaimed Senator Goldwater as the leader of GOP conservatives, wished he could be Presidential nominee, but allowed she would settle for Nixon, rather than accept Rockefeller.

Mrs. Murray's followers are the kind of folks that Vice President Nixon needs badly in his bid for nomination; they provide the militancy required to offset the psychological warfare now being waged against the Californian by the forces aligned with Rockefeller: e.g., the dubious "popularity" polls claiming that Nixon is on the decline, the Madison Avenue techniques to spread the idea he can't be elected, and the "invisible" power of the Rockefeller money.

Professional politicos rate Nixon's chances much higher than do some of the Nixon personal zealots. The pros point out: it is going to be a rare bird in the party's rank and file who will dare to come out against Nixon and for Rockefeller. Why? The average party worker and official has never forgotten the fact that Eisenhower himself once found it necessary to urge the creation of machinery through which he could transfer power to the Vice President, in case he should be disabled. This, together with the fact that the President has suffered a coronary, a stroke and an ileitis operation, prompts sober thoughts among those who look for promotion in the ranks of the party. For, they have firmly in the forefront of their minds the fact that, if Ike

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should transfer power to Nixon, or suffer a fatal illness, Nixon would become not only President, but *per se* the supreme ruler of the Republican party.

Any potential GOP delegate or county chairman who let his name be used by Rockefeller boosters would then face political oblivion for the rest of Nixon's tenure in office. All this ranges a powerful influence on the side of Nixon in the coming struggle for power.

Goldwater Speaking: Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.), prominent Senatorial exponent of labor reform, called on the labor bosses—in a surprise announcement last week—to sit down and discuss with business what he called an ominous situation developing in American politics. Goldwater referred to insistence by various business leaders that business drop its aloofness to politics and organize politically, in an effort to counter the well-demonstrated power of labor's political arm, the Committee on Political Education (COPE). Goldwater expressed his fear that, if business goes into politics, then the two parties would become merely "empty shells," representing business and labor factions.

Goldwater's move served to place labor leaders on the spot. If they should agree to dismantle COPE, they would lose their dominant position in politics. If they spurned Goldwater's suggestion, they would assume responsibility for the start of an era of "class warfare."

Walter Reuther promptly chose the latter course, denouncing the Senator's proposal. The CIO chieftain said that Goldwater wanted to "demobilize" the labor political movement, thus "permitting big business to carry on politics as usual." Big business, as everyone knows, has not so far chosen to challenge labor's political power, partly because of fear of Federal laws which forbid both unions and business corporations from giving money to candidates or parties. Business has so far refrained from using the COPE method of bypassing Federal law; also, business contributions to the right-to-work movement this year were small compared with big labor's. The US Chamber of Commerce, December 8, conservatively estimated that the labor aggregation spent more than $10 million in efforts to defeat right-to-work laws. (*Newsweek* magazine estimated that labor's total spending in California alone ranged up to $25 million.)

With Reuther's rejection of Goldwater's moderate suggestion, business now may well feel free to match the labor union political drive in the next elections.

Alaska: Around Capital GOP circles, Alaskan statehood is labelled "Seaton's Folly." It is well known that Secretary of the Interior Seaton put extraordinary pressure on members of Congress to vote statehood last summer —assuring Republicans that a GOP Senator would be elected from Alaska. In November, he raced madly through the new-born state, campaigning vociferously and promising the voters the moon. Yet, the Democrats won by a clean sweep. Many GOP members of Congress who privately or publicly opposed Alaskan statehood now have their bitter "I told you so."

Troubles for the new state loom endlessly. Father Bernard J. Hubbard, "the Glacier Priest," last week forecast a bleak future for Alaska. He said that "many Alaskan residents are just as distressed as I am about the election results." He emphasized the importance of the union vote, saying it "was union men who helped swing the Democratic party. Considerable labor money was spent to put the Democrats in and I would like to know why. Harry Bridges owns Hawaii and now I'm worried who owns Alaska." (A similar report concerning labor's power in Alaska was relayed by Robert B. Atwood, Editor and Publisher of the Anchorage, Alaska, *Times*.)

Father Hubbard, for many years an opponent of Alaskan statehood, went on to say: "Alaska is so vast and there are so few people that even if everyone is taxed beyond his capacity to pay, the current Federal services (such as schools, roads and police) cannot possibly be kept up to present standards." Heavy taxes, he predicted, would keep firms from going into Alaska to develop its resources.

Election Contributions: An independent investigation by HUMAN EVENTS has unearthed hitherto unpublished evidence, suggesting that the funds spent by Democrats and their labor-boss friends are much greater than is reflected in Federal tabulations.

Democratic candidates who are known beneficiaries of union spending sometimes file incredibly low statements with the Clerk of the House of Representatives—supposedly in compliance with Federal election law; for example, in 1956, Senator Frank Church of Idaho, who was backed by thousands of dollars of out-of-state funds, listed only $1500 in contributions. This gimmick is possible because the Federal Corrupt Practices Act requires that candidates list money given *to* them or expended for them with their consent, instead of all money spent in their behalf. Church's GOP opponent, Senator Herman Welker, straightforwardly listed dollars spent for him, as well as those given to him. The resulting figures for Church and Welker were then tossed into the final summation that showed the GOP receiving far more dollars than the Democrats. (The candidates, both beneficiaries of substantial backing, had in reality received contributions of about the same magnitude. For the exclusive story on this campaign, see HUMAN EVENTS for February 9, 1957.)

To discover if similar dipsy-doodle tactics were being employed this year, HUMAN EVENTS conducted a spot-check on a nearby Congressional race—that between Republican DeWitt Hyde and Democrat John Foley in Maryland's Sixth District. Here's what investigation disclosed:

At the office of the Clerk of the House, Hyde listed contributions totaling $21,781. Foley, the victorious labor-backed candidate, listed the fantastically low total of $620—in a statement which made no mention whatever of labor unions. These lopsided figures will go into the total reckoning for Democratic and GOP contributions.

But, a trip to the County Courthouse in Rockville, Maryland, revealed an entirely different story to HUMAN EVENTS investigators. There—where state law requires filings of all funds spent in a candidate's behalf—the Foley balance sheet was somewhat altered. Contributions totaling no less than $18,738 were listed by the "Foley for Congress Committee" —a sum roughly 30 times as great as that en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tered with the Federal authorities. (Over $6800 of this was from labor unions.) By way of contrast, the statement listed in Maryland by Republican Hyde was actually $6 less than that filed with the Clerk of the House.

The $6800 admitted to have been spent by labor unions in the Montgomery county filing of expenses may not prove to be the entire amount expended by the bosses there, by any means. It is well known that COPE, and labor-union agents operating under sponsorship other than COPE, sometimes enter districts in "flying squads," and contribute handsomely to precinct work—not the least by providing manpower for campaign activity. It may prove a difficult task, requiring some real digging by staffs of the House and Senate election committees, to unearth facts and figures which would give the full magnitude of the labor-Democratic expenditures in all elections.

Third Party: ADA "liberals," in dealing a series of exuberant blows to their Southern colleagues in the Democratic party, may have bought more trouble than they realize. This is the conclusion of informed sources in the Capital, in the aftermath of a fierce intraparty row a week ago. When the Democratic National Committee assembled here last week, the chief business before it was whether it would seat, as National Committeeman from Louisiana, a so-called "moderate" who had been repudiated by his own state party, or a staunch segregationist that the Louisianans had chosen for the post. The National Committee voted in favor of the "moderate," one Camille Gravel, and thus deprived the Louisianans of their own chosen representation in the party councils.

HUMAN EVENTS staffers on hand at the Sheraton-Park Hotel for this crucial set-to found Southern opinion hardening under this attack from the ADA branch of the party. A particular object of Southern enmity is Democratic Chairman Paul Butler. Washingtonians in touch with Southern sentiment say that Butler's recent hostility to the South, the anti-Southern remarks of such as California Committeeman Ziffren (whom Senator Knowland revealed as being linked to high-level gangsters) and the Gravel incident have pushed the South too far.

Taking shape in Dixie is a move that some conservatives have long envisioned: a campaign to withhold the South's Electoral votes from the Democratic candidate—who will have to be a Reuther puppet—so as to deprive either major party of a majority in the Electoral College. This would throw the election into the House of Representatives, where Southern bargaining power would be vastly increased (see "A Southern President?" by John J. Synon, in HUMAN EVENTS for August 11, 1958).

To date, such calculations have been in the realm of speculation and fancy; now, in the wake of the Gravel uproar, political analysts say that the South is waking up, realizing how badly deteriorated the Democratic party is, and is preparing to act. The seating of Camille Gravel, paradoxically, has raised new hopes for a conservative revival.

Derthick Shows His Hand: At the time of its passage last year, backers of the "National Defense Education Act" worked hard to portray that Federal-aid scheme as a piece of "minimal" legislation, urgently needed to bolster the Nation's military security. Now, Washington notes with astonishment, proponents of the law are more outspoken in admitting its significance as a crucial opening wedge—a "camel's nose in the tent"—exactly as its opponents charged. Lawrence G. Derthick, US Commissioner of Education, speaking last month at the first Regional Conference to implement the bill (more will follow), told his audience that "this Act is one of the most comprehensive pieces of legislation concerning education ever passed by Congress. Its scope is sweeping and its provisions touch at some of the most critical points in our educational system. . . . "

"In a very real sense," Derthick continued, "the National Defense Education Act represents a major breakthrough in the area of Federal concern for education . . . its impact will be felt for many years to come."

Economy: Despite the misrepresentations of the big spenders, who shrill that an $80 billion Budget is necessary for our "national defense," some hard facts about skyrocketing Government costs are beginning to filter out of the bureaucracy.

A HUMAN EVENTS survey of figures released recently by the Treasury Department shows how much faster "nonmilitary" expenditures are rising than are military outlays. Defense spending for the first four months of Fiscal '59 is up about $38 million over the comparable period last year, but non-Defense disbursements have gone up by a whopping $844 million.

The Defense spending represents a .28 per cent increase over last year, while the non-Defense outlay represents a 5.9 per cent increase. In other words, the nonmilitary increase was about 21 times that of the military portion of the Budget.

Right to Work: HUMAN EVENTS receives this report from a worker who did much to help put across the successful right-to-work referendum in Kansas this year: "Most of the left-wing Republican leaders are trying, with some success, to blame all their shortcomings on the right to work. Right here in Sedgwick County, we had an excellent demonstration of the fate of Republican candidates who are trying to look like left-wing Democrats. Since the Republicans stood for little or nothing, the party attracted no leadership and no capable spokesmen. The Democratic party, with a good organization and active leadership, captured the election handily. The conservative community leaders—the people who make every worthwhile project successful—rallied to the support of the right to work and thereby put it across. Most of these people are naturally inclined to be Republicans but, because they found few conservative principles in the Republican platform, they gave the party no active support. The Republican party could have run as strong or stronger than the right to work, had it stood for principles which would attract the type of leadership we had in right to work. I think this is the lesson the Republican party must learn if it is to survive." (For further comment, see "Right to Work: How It Won In Kansas," on page 4 of this News Section.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Right to Work: How It Won In Kansas

By Reed Larson

Executive Vice President, Kansans for the Right to Work

"The *total vote in our small town was not large, but we were able to give the right to work a good majority. The banker's wife and a union carpenter employed in the nearby city made up the team that hauled in our right-to-work vote.*"

This simple report, one of many received by "Kansans for the Right to Work," following the November 4 election, eloquently spells out the type of grass-roots activity which won the right-to-work referendum in Kansas (395,839 to 307,176), while similar measures went down to defeat in five other states. The Kansas experience shows that right to work *can* win at the polls, even in industrialized areas where unionism is strong. It can win with *people*—businessmen, housewives, wage-earners, farmers, and everyone else—openly identified and working to get the story across. This type of support can be obtained in sufficient quantity only when business leaders come out from behind the cloak of anonymity afforded by business organizations to say that they, as individuals, oppose compulsory unionism.

The right to work carried in 93 of Kansas' 105 counties, including heavily industrialized and highly unionized Sedgwick (Wichita), the state's most populous county. The measure lost heavily in only three counties, all of them representing cities in which few if any business leaders openly supported the right to work. The contrast between results in the state's two largest cities is significant. The referendum carried in Sedgwick County by 45,843 to 45,806, while in Wyandotte County (Kansas City) it lost by nearly three to one, 12,700 to 36,515.

The Sedgwick County vote demonstrates that a large percentage of rank-and-file union members will support freedom of choice when given an opportunity to understand the issue. Thousands upon thousands of Wichita union members voted for the right-to-work amendment in order to make this vote-count possible.

Wichita industry is highly unionized. The Democratic county organization is completely controlled by union officials. County Democratic chairman M. R. Lee is a full-time salaried employee of the UAW-CIO. His paycheck comes from out-of-state, paid with money taken from union dues. Lee, through a generously staffed COPE, conducted a thorough registration drive among union members.

The unions' political organization had plenty of money, plenty of manpower. Union advertising money was poured into Wichita—even more, proportionately, than was spent in the rest of the state. But something went wrong. While this well-oiled machine was delivering a majority in Sedgwick County of nearly two-to-one for the Democratic gubernatorial candidate (neither the Democrat nor the Republican candidate favored right to work), the very same voters were giving an edge to the right to work.

Reuther's formula was upset by *active participation on the part of local citizens*. Wichita businessmen and other community leaders courageously let their position be known. The head of nearly every Wichita firm wrote letters to all employees stating frankly that he, the writer, was supporting the right to work, and explaining why. Among the active businessmen were executives of Boeing Airplane, Cessna Aircraft, The Coleman Company (heating and air conditioning), Kansas Milling, Southwest Grease & Oil, Love Box Company, Vickers Petroleum and many others.

On the other hand, in Kansas City, Kansas, right to work had almost no public support from businessmen. The two courageous small business people who took a stand for the amendment found themselves conspicuously alone. A number of union members, retired people, professional people and others wanted to help; but they dared not step forward to face the wrath of entrenched union officials when almost all major business leaders in their area were apparently cowed by union power.

In every other worthwhile endeavor, whether it be United Fund, Red Cross, YMCA, or any other, communities look to, and find, leadership from business people. In opposing such overwhelming odds as those given to the privileged power of professional unionists, only a few of the most recklessly courageous will speak out so long as leaders of business remain silent. This doesn't imply that the sole leadership of a right-to-work campaign should come from corporations or from business associations. Every citizen has a stake in this fundamental freedom—and every type of person should participate in the fight to regain it.

Three factors were fundamental in providing the basis for a successful right-to-work campaign in Kansas:

1. **Dedicated Volunteer Leadership.** Citizens who are respected and are dedicated to this principle were willing to devote as much time and energy as necessary to passage of the right to work.
2. **United Effort.** Business organizations, farm organizations, and trade associations worked together in complete dedication to the cause of right to work.
3. **Early Start.** A three-year educational program was carried on before April, 1957, when the legislature, by the necessary two-thirds vote, placed right to work on the ballot as a constitutional amendment. The referendum campaign itself was planned and carried out on a 15-month schedule.

The potential to pass the right to work exists in every one of the 30 states which still permit compulsory unionism. The housewives, wage-earners, professional people, farmers, and small businessmen who must make up the right-to-work team at the grass roots are present in every state. But they cannot challenge the concentrated power of the labor leaders until the leaders of business—big business—make up their minds to stand on principle, and give the small businessman and the wage-earner assurance that business leaders, *as individuals*, will defend the right of every person to decide for himself whether or not he joins a union.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.
For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second-class matter, Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

Frank C. Hanighen, *Editor and Publisher* — James L. Wick, *Executive Publisher*
M. Stanton Evans, *Managing Editor* — Frank Chodorov, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 50 HUMAN EVENTS December 15, 1958

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

'SOCIAL ENGINEERING' FOR 1984

A Little-Known Movement is Changing America

By Jo Hindman

At the White House Conference on Education in 1955, Americans were introduced to a technique known as "group dynamics," whereby committees studying various educational subjects were manipulated into coming up with predetermined conclusions. Persons with a bias toward Federal aid to education, for instance, were favored as delegates at the state preliminaries which preceded the Washington meeting. On the eve of the Conference, prevailing sentiment was reported by the Communist *Daily Worker*: "The demand for Federal aid is on the lips of every responsible thinking person as this Conference convenes."

The predetermined conclusion favoring Federal aid was to be promoted, through "group dynamics," by a corps of "planted idea carriers" who were all set to extract the pro-Federal aid recommendation from their respective subcommittees. News of this development was spread around at the time, and produced a sense of shock in some people who were unprepared for such advances toward "togetherness."

"Group dynamics" would be disturbing enough if it were an isolated phenomenon. As it is, the technique is merely the best-publicized instance of an accumulating body of evidence—evidence which shows that a powerful movement is afoot to subject whole areas of American life to the sway of self-appointed "social engineers." The result, according to available evidence, would be a world uncomfortably similar to that described by George Orwell in his famous novel, *1984*.

At work to achieve this goal is a whole array of individual "engineers," Government officials, planners, free-lance collectivists and crackpots. The drive pops up in many different guises, occasioned by one or another legislative proposal at the state or Federal level. The much-agitated "mental health" issue, for example, in reality represents a dispute over one zone of the "social engineering" movement.

The principal danger of this "engineering" movement—and of such of its subdivisions as "mental health"—is that it equates certain political opinions with sanity and "right" thinking, and brands their opposition as sickness. Here, for example, is a classic definition of the symptoms of developing mental illness, new style. Dr. H. A. Overstreet, in his *The Great Enterprise—Relating Ourselves to Our World*, states:

> **"A man, for example, may be angrily against racial equality, public housing, the TVA, financial and technical aid to backward countries, organized labor, and the preaching of social rather than salvational religion. . . . Such people may appear 'normal' in the sense that they are able to hold a job and otherwise maintain their status as members of society; but they are, we now recognize, well along the road toward mental illness."**

Similarly, acceptance of "world citizenship" is linked with mental health by the following statement of the 1948 International Congress on Mental Health in London: "World citizenship can be widely extended among all peoples through the application of the principles of mental health. *Principles of mental health cannot be successfully furthered in any society unless there is progressive acceptance of the concept of world citizenship.*" (Italics added.)

In other words, a person adhering to conservative ideas is defined as mentally unbalanced. Similar formulae appear in such books as *The Authoritarian Personality* and *The New American Right*, which attempt to show that those who reject statism do so because of frustrations and neuroses. Thus, the so-called "normal" world is the world of pseudo-liberalism. Determination that those who reject it are simply "sick," of course, makes that much easier the job of engineering people, willing or unwilling, into living in it.

To cross the threshold of the "social engineering" fraternity is to enter a realm where pretentious gobbledygook passes as everyday speech. Key words in the "engineers'" vocabulary include such terms as "sociogram," "sociodrama," "psychotherapy," "psychodrama," "telephenomena," "inter-personal relations" and other sociometric this-and-thats.

Sociometry compounds a variety of techniques and concepts from psychology, social and cultural anthropology, psychiatry and biology; it embraces a hodge-podge of activity suggested by its

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weird vocabulary, which is considerably more formidable than the things it represents.

For example, in spite of its high-sounding title, a "sociogram" is merely a chart resembling a maze of pool-table shots, diagramming such facts as whether "Helen chooses Frances," whether "Betty is Mary's first choice" and so on. Lines drawn between circles with peoples' names in them constitute a sociogram, and sociograms chart interpersonal paths between members of groups as small as three, as large as 250 people, or even more.

The object of sociometry is to apply all of its techniques to the activities of human groups with such scientific exactness that their behavior will be channeled along the paths desired by the planners.

Most influential of the "social engineers" is a man named J. L. Moreno, a Viennese social scientist who arrived in New York in 1925, forearmed with the "sociogram," the "psychodrama" and other sociometric techniques. Soon after arrival, Moreno teamed up with Dr. Bela Schick, who, as recently as 1957, was identified as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, a chief instrument of the Communist party in its conspiratorial attack against the processes of American government. Dr. Schick brought Moreno before a gathering of physicians and nurses at Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York, where the social engineer demonstrated the technique of psychotherapy, as described above. Moreno was on his way.

Over in Europe, Dr. Moreno apparently had been casting about for the best way of employing his new science. Ruminating on where to "plant" his ideas of reshaping human society, he rejected the idea of taking his plan to Soviet Russia, for the simple reason that a similar plan—Marxism itself—was already being tried there. So he brought his social engineering to the United States. He reminisced: "I preferred to be the midwife to an incoherent, confused, democratic way of life, then *the commissar of a highly organized world." Moreno applauded the "dictatorship of the proletariat," but expressed distaste for Stalinist methods. He decided to replace the global socio-economic proletarian revolution with "small" sociometric revolutions.*

DR. MORENO'S VIEWS about the sociometric revolution and Dr. Shick's connections with one of America's most notorious Communist fronts are not the only evidence of a strong affinity between the sociometry movement and those sympathetic to Moscow. The case of sociometrist Mark Zborowski, Soviet agent, is perhaps the most sensational revelation to date of the kind of people involved in this movement. Zborowski, a self-confessed hireling of Moscow convicted of perjury in November, 1958, has enjoyed patronage and professional advancement into the most sensitive positions in America, all under the guise of mental health research. His progress along a chain of influence is so revealing an episode that it deserves its own sociogram.

Russian-born Zborowski, who spied upon the Trotsky entourage in Paris under orders from Stalin, entered the United States in 1946. He worked on a US Navy research project at Columbia University, directed by Communist-fronter Ruth Benedict, where his immediate supervisor was the controversial anthropologist, Margaret Mead, who is a one-world mental health official and untiring supporter of the social engineering movement.

Helping Zborowski get Federal support was Lawrence K. Frank, mental health official. Zborowski applied for work on a sociometric project at a Veterans Administration hospital analyzing the reactions of hospitalized veterans "involved in the pain experience." Frank signed Zborowski's request for the job. The application was reviewed by the mental health study section and by the National Advisory Mental Health Council, where sat officials prominently identified with social engineering. Dr. S. Bernard Wortis was present on the National Advisory Mental Health Council at the time Zborowski's application was reviewed, and Margaret Mead and Leonard S. Cottrell, dean at Cornell University, held positions on the Mental Health Research Study section. Soviet agent Zborowski got the job.

Three years later, Zborowski sought patronage from the Russell Sage Foundation in New York, where Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. edits *Sociometry,* the magazine founded by Dr. Moreno. The Foundation's board of trustees approved and advanced funds for Zborowski's continued study at the Bronx Veterans Administration hospital, with "greater independence as director of the project" —an unexplained adjustment that was effected simply by removing Zborowski's name from the Federal payroll and placing him on a Russell Sage grant. Zborowski was sentenced on December 8, identified as a henchman in a Soviet espionage ring in this country.

* * *

In 1955, with Margaret Mead and others of her ilk, Moreno backed a variety of one-worldism being advanced through something called "Children's International Summer Villages." CISV assembles children of different nationalities and races and gives them practice in living together in summer villages; this experience supposedly is a sample of future one-world life. The children, moreover, return to their home groups as socio-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

metrized "agents." Literature from CISV was distributed at a UNESCO gathering in San Francisco in 1957. UNESCO features Moreno-type sociograms in its teacher-training publications, included in the notorious booklet series, *Towards World Understanding.**

Moreno tirelessly promoted his ideas in social science circles, and even succeeded in reaching the Nirvana of the collectivist planners: his plan was taken up by a Government agency. In the early 'thirties, through his numerous contacts, he obtained an introduction to President Franklin Roosevelt. Subsequently, in a New Deal experiment called the "Centerville" project (a fictitious name supplied by the social engineers), American families were arranged in a neighborhood according to a chart laid out upon social engineering principles. A "key" family was strategically located so that its influence would have far-reaching effects in molding the attitudes of the entire community. The results of the experiment were checked out by secret ballot of the families and by quizzing children about family conversations.

Summing up the "Centerville" project in 1936, Dr. Moreno's magazine announced: "For the first time in 20 years, since Moreno began to develop the application of his sociometric technique in European resettlement programs during World War I, sociometric principles have been applied to an open community." The object of such experiments is to produce a predictable set of community attitudes, stimulated by "key" agents who have been placed in the community according to sociometric principles of influence and leadership.

● *The "Centerville" experiment has by now lapsed into obscurity, but so-called "city planning" programs and the current gigantic "metro" government plan display many symptoms of the social engineering mentality. A rough estimate of how far the movement has proceeded may be formed upon inspection of the "urban renewal" and "community redevelopment" projects, which promote the knock-down-build-up craze that is evacuating US homeowners by the thousands.*

● The parallel movement of "metropolitan government" also bears sociometric markings. "Metro" proposes to collect independent units of municipal government under a big super-government, and to maintain control of such bodies through something described as "appointed executive" administration. Since these proposed metropolitan districts frequently cross state lines, the very concept of government units corresponding to them makes hash of our Constitution, which vests all reserved governing powers in the several states.

● *Similarly, the "guided minds" program in the public schools, which has been frequently discussed in the columns of* HUMAN EVENTS, *is a subdivision of the "social engineering" movement. Hidden sociometrists have been doodling in the schools for some time, unknown to the students or to the parents whose home life and socio-economic status come under close scrutiny. The "cum" files in school offices, containing cumulative information concerning pupils and their parents, provide information from which sociometrists perform research, write papers, and publish social engineering conclusions.*

Not all schoolhouses are infested by the amazing snoopers, but in schools dominated by highly experimental practices, "cum" files, when opened unexpectedly to prevent file-stripping, reveal to parents an amazing sight. In a goulash of data are found transcripts of statements uttered by parents, students' autobiographies written as classroom assignments, and innocent remarks of children collected in notebook "logs" by teachers who are thorough agents of observation.

● *Apart from community planning programs and the "counseling" advocated at the school level by the engineers, there is the pyrotechnical subject of "mental health," which has been the most widely condemned aspect of the entire movement.*

ACCORDING TO A publication of the University of Chicago, a person with a 100 per cent mental health rating would have no "defenses" at all and would simply agree to "adjust." Social engineers say: "This type of personality is very responsive to change in the outside world and within himself." And: "Good adjustment is attained when a patient leaves his pattern of socially unrewarded defenses for a pattern of socially acceptable defenses." (*Psychotherapy and Personality Change*, Rogers and Dymond; pp. 162, 161.)

When all the smoke has cleared, the central question involved in "mental health" is simply this: is mental illness a clinical disorder to be diagnosed on the basis of medical evidence, or is it a political matter to be decided by left-wing ideologues seeking to promote one-worldism and similar programs?

Because this is the important question, current "mental health" agitation should not be confounded with humanitarian legislation to deal with mental illness. The confusion between medically diagnosed mental disorder and politically diagnosed "frustrations" has allowed mental-health politics to ride the coattails of legitimate concern for the insane.

* This was the series that contained the famous statement: "As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should, therefore, use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The roll of those who have been declared mentally "unhealthy" as an outgrowth of political controversy—in line with the Overstreet definition and the London manifesto—is a growing one. Some celebrated cases include the following: George Lichner, a student in Chicago who was sent to a psychiatrist because of deviationist behavior—George drew up a petition asking for segregated schools; Fletcher Bartholomew, the Radio Free Europe employee who was drugged, strapped into a strait jacket and carried against his will across Europe and the United States, all because he criticized a number of RFE personnel; the Finn twins, who were committed to solitary confinement in a Federal prison, with their sanity discredited, because they accused certain public officials of engaging in illegal activity to deprive them of their property; Povl Bang-Jensen, the UN official accused of mental illness because he would not turn over a list of anti-Communist witnesses of the Hungarian Revolution to the UN Secretariat, where they might fall into the hands of the Communists; A. R. Fitzpatrick, a Californian who was arraigned for irrational behavior because he vehemently opposed America's swing to collectivism and because his protests incurred the dislike of a county supervisor; Whittaker Chambers, who was falsely accused, by innuendo, of being mentally unbalanced when he testified against Alger Hiss. Additional cases could be cited.

The "mental health" gambit has become so common that the forces of the left have even found it being turned against themselves. When Negro Professor Clennon King attempted to "integrate" the University of Mississippi by introducing himself there, Mississippi authorities decided that he must be unbalanced, and had him placed under observation!

Thus, in Chicago, to favor segregation is mental illness; in Mississippi the definition is reversed. This is the natural end result when political definitions of mental health are substituted for clinical ones; the political authorities can simply use the charge of mental illness to enforce their views on those who disagree with them.

The "social engineers," in addition to defining their opponents as sick, have developed a number of other techniques for getting their way. "Group dynamics," as worked up at the White House Conference, was one of these. Another technique is that of obtaining "canned" samples of public opinion, then presenting these to Governmental bodies as the will of the people. The State Department, which has been using this practice for a number of years to push its program, was caught red-handed at it in 1957. Poll "engineers" were striving for answers favoring foreign aid; in addition to slanted queries, a key question was worded so that answers to it would produce a biased finding.

Inspection of the State Department poll discloses a striking resemblance to one detail of sociometry's political program, which calls for a Federal Department of Human Relations, tied to miniature substructures rooted in school, home and workshop. The object of this apparatus, as decribed in Moreno's book, *Sociometry: An Approach to a New Political Orientation*, is to activate direct channels of communication with the "People" for the "dynamic" teaching of social integration. Public opinion, as in the State Department poll, would be shuttled past the elected House and Senate, direct to the Department of Human Relations. With group dynamics in operation, and opposing opinion bludgeoned to conformity by group psychotherapy, or expelled as mentally sick, the resulting sociometric dictatorship would have easy sailing.

IN THE NATURE of the amorphous growth of the social sciences, it is difficult to determine the precise extent of "sociometry's" influence. Undoubtedly, millions have been spent on sociometric experiment to date, and billions more hang in the balance, as programs such as urban renewal and mental health await legislative decisions. Perhaps one of the most ominous notations concerning the advance of this new discipline was a remark dropped by Moreno himself. Writing of his ideas back in 1940, the chief sociometrist observed: "The fondest dream of my youth has come true, they are already used anonymously in many places."

Too long has this subject been obscured by hysterical charges and counter-charges, and too often have its dangers been dismissed as the imaginings of the excitable. It is time that responsible men and women took a long, stern look at the phenomenon of social engineering. They must decide if it is molding the kind of America in which they want their children to live.

Jo Hindman is a West Coast researcher and writer who has contributed to a number of conservative periodicals, including *The Freeman*.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "'SOCIAL ENGINEERING' FOR 1984" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED